

020-01

Comment acknowledged; the Forest Service will issue its final Wild and Scenic River Act determination after publication of this Final EIS, and the Wallowa-Whitman Forest Supervisor will make a separate decision whether or not to issue a special use permit for modifications of the Imnaha Satellite Facility located on National Forest lands.

020-02

The Imnaha Final Rearing Facility is no longer proposed for construction (see Section 1.2 in the Final EIS); see response 012-02. The activity proposed at this site is limited to removal of an existing Acrow (steel panel) bridge and concrete bridge abutments, and recovery of the affected ground to a more natural condition. The bridge panels would be reinstalled at the Lostine Adult Collection Facility and the concrete bridge abutments would be hauled off-site for disposal.

020-03

BPA believes that the information needed for the Forest Service to make a final determination under Section 7(a) of the WSRA is provided in this Final EIS, the Biological Assessment prepared for the project (previously provided to the Forest Service and incorporated by reference in its entirety into this EIS), other supporting documentation presented to the Forest Service, and in the responses to Forest Service comments 020-06 through 020-50 below.

020-04

Comment acknowledged; thank you. Forest Service collaboration in this effort for conservation and recovery of spring/summer chinook in Northeast Oregon is appreciated.

020-05

Comment noted; BPA acknowledges that the Forest Service report is based on the Draft EIS, knowledge of Forest Service staff, and other references as cited.

020-06

The Imnaha Final Rearing Facility is no longer proposed for construction (see responses 012-02 and 020-02). The Proposed Action should result in improvements to Wild and Scenic River values at this location of the Imnaha River.

020-07

Comment acknowledged; proposed modifications at the Imnaha Satellite Facility are anticipated to result in minor changes to channel structure.

020-08

Comment acknowledged; Imnaha River flows are too low for boating at proposed sites.

020-09

Comment acknowledged; construction of the Imnaha Satellite Facility would add about 0.12 acres of new impervious surface (see revised text in the Final EIS, Chapter 2) and increased runoff during construction of the facility is expected to be short-lived.

020-10

Comment acknowledged; construction of the Imnaha Satellite Facility could result in temporary, minor, and localized bank erosion.

020-11

Current facility withdrawals are about 6 cfs and occur from May through September. The Final EIS text has been revised (see Sections 1.6 and 2.3) to state that, under the proposed project, surface water withdrawals of 9.6 cfs would be diverted from the river annually for juvenile acclimation and release during March and April; about 6 cfs would be diverted for adult bypass (May through September); and an additional 20.3 cfs would be diverted during adult collection and holding (about June through September). No surface water withdrawals are anticipated from October through February.

020-12

Comment acknowledged; see response 020-10.

020-13

Comment acknowledged; see responses 020-10 and -11.

020-14

Comment acknowledged; Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) of the Imnaha Wild and Scenic River are addressed individually in the comments and responses that follow.

020-15

Comment acknowledged; modifications at the Imnaha Satellite Facility would not be noticeable to most visitors and the general appearance of the area would be little changed from existing conditions.

020-16

Bringing a buried powerline 6 miles from a substation to the Imnaha Satellite Facility is no longer part of the Proposed Action. Power would continue to be provided by existing on-site generators resulting in no change from the existing condition relative to noise or recreational opportunity.

020-17

Comment acknowledged. Among the purposes of the Proposed Action are conservation and recovery of ESA-listed spring/summer chinook.

Overall production program success is a pre-existing goal under the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan and the conservation/recovery objectives of the ESA permitting program. Project-specific performance standards were developed by project co-managers and reviewed by the Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) and

finalized as the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for Northeast Oregon Hatchery Imnaha and Grande Ronde Subbasin Spring Chinook Salmon (Hesse and Harbeck 2004). Monitoring and evaluation elements of this plan would be applied to the proposed project and are incorporated into the Final EIS and Biological Assessment by reference.

020-18

The potential for site-specific erosion and how to avoid it would be addressed in detailed facility design and erosion and sediment control specifications prepared as part of project construction documents during the final design phase of the project. The project design would include measures to avoid long-term erosion related to the placement of in-water structures as well as temporary, construction-related erosion (Draft EIS project description and Sections 3.2.3.2 and 3.5.3.5). Some localized and increased bank erosion typically occurs when placing structures in an active river system. Proper project design and construction would reduce this erosion as much as possible. Therefore, project design documents would clearly show proper placement for hatchery structures; define areas of clearing and grubbing; specify locations of silt fences; and provide details for sedimentation ponds, access road preparation and maintenance, and any other permanent or temporary erosion control measures. Best management practices specified in construction documents would be in accordance with Oregon Department of Transportation's Erosion and Sediment Control Specification 0280. Best management practices would, most likely, be included as conditions of the various permits required for the project. All permit conditions would be followed.

Construction noise and activities may alter the behavior and distribution of fish in the area (e.g., interrupt migration and spawning of those adult spring/summer chinook that are not needed for broodstock, impact juvenile chinook rearing, and delay bull trout migration), but these impacts are short-lived and are not expected to affect long-term use, passage, abundance, or distribution of fish (FishPro/HDR 2004a).

020-19

As described in this Final EIS (Section 1.6 and revisions to Draft EIS Section 3.2.3.2 in Chapter 2), instream work at the Imnaha Satellite Facility would include modifications of the surface water intake structure, installation of a replacement weir, and installation of a diffuser chamber and auxiliary water supply line. A new fish ladder is no longer proposed at this site. All instream work would take place behind a cofferdam and would be performed during instream work windows established by ODFW to minimize potential impacts, with primary consideration to threatened, endangered, and sensitive species. Instream work windows were established to avoid the most vulnerable life stages (typically juveniles). Therefore, limiting project work to the instream work window would minimize potential impacts to fish. Project permit applications would also be reviewed by NOAA Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Oregon Department of State Lands, and ODFW to ensure compliance with federal and state guidelines for instream construction and fish passage during construction.

As described in detail in the project Biological Assessment (Sections 4.2 and 5), in-water construction could temporarily delay migrant fish passage, including bull trout and spring/summer chinook not collected at downstream facilities (i.e., fish that were passed upstream for natural spawning). Adult Imnaha steelhead are early spring spawners, and would not likely be affected by proposed in-water work. Fisheries biologists would perform daily discrete bank surveys to determine if migrants were being delayed or otherwise stressed during in-water work periods and consult with regulatory agencies, if necessary, to minimize adverse effects on fish (project Biological Assessment, page 94).

020-20

The replacement weir proposed for the existing Imnaha Satellite Facility was specifically designed to efficiently and safely accommodate migrating fish, including bull trout; see response 012-04. As under current operations, no non-target fish (including bull trout) would be held for more than 24 hours. Typically during fish trapping, monitoring would occur much more frequently than once per 24-hour period. All non-target fish would be allowed to pass above the weir. The replacement weir will facilitate downstream migration of bull trout and will be a slight improvement over the existing situation.

020-21

The replacement weir would have a clear bar spacing of 1-1/4 inches, which would allow juvenile fish to pass directly through it when it is in operation (Grassel 2003). The final design of the weir would be coordinated with and approved by NOAA Fisheries and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Juvenile fish passage should be improved over existing conditions (Biological Assessment Section 4.2.2).

020-22

Refer to response 012-04 and to Section 1.10 of the Final EIS for a summary of all project mitigation and monitoring. As stated in the Draft EIS (Section 3.2.3.2) and discussed in the project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2), the replacement weir would be designed to allow operators to raise and lower the weir (or individual weir panels) to guide migrating adults into the fish ladder and holding facility and to allow migrating kelts, adult bull trout, or chinook to move downstream over the weir. Juvenile fish would be able to pass through the spacing on the weir pickets. An auxiliary water supply pipeline, intended to augment the attraction flow of the existing fish ladder, would be installed behind an existing concrete wall beside the ladder. Improved attraction would result in less migratory delay and a decreased likelihood of downstream spawning than under current conditions (due to insufficient attraction flow from the existing fish ladder, some chinook that would normally spawn farther upstream have spawned downstream of the existing facility). Construction timing would coincide with the weir installation. Because the supply line would be installed behind the concrete wall, the existing fish ladder would operate during construction. The modified fish ladder and expanded adult holding area were designed to provide operational flexibility, improve fish passage both upstream and downstream, improve fish attraction, and improve operator safety in comparison to existing facilities. These improvements were designed in accordance with NOAA Fisheries criteria for adult collection and holding facilities.

020-23

As described in the project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2, pages 94-96), the habitat available for salmonids would be limited during periods of low river flow (i.e., drought conditions) regardless of facility requirements.

Seasonally, facility operation may reduce fish habitat and utilization, particularly for juvenile chinook that are known to occur in the immediate vicinity of the facility. The increase in the amount of water diverted from the intake to the outfall compared to existing conditions is not expected to affect juvenile bull trout use because low flows occur in September, when bull trout are likely upstream of the Imnaha Satellite Facility in cooler headwaters. Younger steelhead juveniles may move upstream and downstream within the Imnaha and its tributaries during summer and fall and could use the diversion reach for rearing. However, ample rearing habitat is available for all species upstream and downstream of the existing diversion reach and juveniles may migrate there during periods of extreme low flows.

Intake structure improvements would disturb an area of river bed and bank about 30 feet long by 30 feet wide and require placement of about 100 cy of riprap. The auxiliary water supply line would be installed behind an existing concrete wall and require the placement of minor amounts of riprap to stabilize the pipeline entrance.

Habitat disturbance would be minor, and suitable habitat for spawning and rearing is available and occurs in areas surrounding and adjacent to both of these sites. Any compensatory requirements for habitat loss would be determined at the time of project permitting, including reauthorization of the Forest Service Special Use Permit to allow the proposed facility improvements.

020-24

A new fish ladder is no longer proposed for the Imnaha Satellite Facility. Most other proposed facilities (water supply pipeline, septic drainfield, rock sluiceway, improvements to the holding area, and water supply lines) would be constructed behind existing facility walls and/or on uplands; thereby, avoiding instream activities and habitat effects. The replacement weir, proposed diffuser box to be placed at the base of the fish ladder, and modified water intake would all involve in-water work conducted during ODFW's instream work window. The proposed modifications would be an improvement to the existing facility and facility operations. The potential effects of construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed facilities on fish are discussed in detail in the project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2 under the Imnaha Sites subsection, pages 92-98). Also see response 012-04.

020-25

Refer to response 020-23.

020-26

Refer to response 020-23. The intake location is in low quality, previously altered habitat with limited vegetation or in-water structure for fish. Habitat at the weir and ladder sites is of similar (low) quality due to existing facility components. At both the weir and the intake locales, the pools would be maintained, which provide an element of habitat diversity themselves. Although no mitigation is proposed to compensate for habitat losses, proposed improvements to the fish ladder, including improved attraction from the proposed auxiliary water supply, will facilitate upstream and downstream fish migration. Additional attraction water should alleviate most of the existing difficulties that fish currently have in locating the ladder entrance.

Additionally, the proposed hydraulically operated weir would provide the flexibility to lower individual panels to allow downstream passage of steelhead kelts and bull trout. When not in operation, the new weir would lie flat under the water to allow downstream passage. A section on the left abutment would also be placed at a slightly lower elevation to support both upstream and downstream fish passage by providing a deeper channel for migration. Any compensatory requirements for habitat loss would be determined at the time of project permitting, including reauthorization of the Forest Service Special Use Permit to allow the proposed facility improvements.

020-27

The Imnaha Conservation/Recovery Program is an existing and on-going program authorized by NOAA Fisheries Section 10 Permit No. 1128. As part of the permit process, the program received scientific scrutiny through NOAA Fisheries peer and public review. NOAA Fisheries determined that the direct take of these listed fish for hatchery broodstock, and the release of their progeny, would be beneficial to the Imnaha population (Delarm, NOAA Fisheries, personal communication as cited in Ashe et al. 2000). Smolt release under the existing production program would be expected to continue, as it has in the past, in accordance with all applicable permits and in consultation with NOAA Fisheries regardless of whether the proposed improvements at the Imnaha Satellite Facility were implemented.

Though the co-managers are unaware of scientific, peer-reviewed documentation of hatchery fish “swamping natural production” in the Imnaha River, they have provided a contingency by “scaling” broodstock collection from across the entire returning adult run using a sliding scale that incorporates both wild and hatchery fish as broodstock based on the total number of returning adults. The program also allows hatchery broodstock to spawn naturally above the weir in their natural environments, with the resulting offspring considered wild fish. The adult sliding scale is based on the premise that at low population levels the greatest risk to persistence is demographic. But at higher population levels genetic concerns take priority. Therefore, with the sliding scale, fewer constraints are placed on the number of hatchery adults spawning in nature when the population is low. As population levels increase, demographic risks decrease and, in response, greater constraints are placed on hatchery adults spawning in nature. Details of the adult sliding scale are discussed in the Section 10 Permit Applications submitted to NOAA Fisheries (ODFW 1998a and 1998b).

020-28

Refer to responses 020-22, -23, -26, and -27. As stated in this EIS and the project Biological Assessment, operation of the attraction-improved fish ladder and replacement weir would benefit target and non-target species through improved attraction to the ladder (resulting in less migratory delay) and better downstream passage for steelhead kelts and bull trout (with the capacity to lower individual weir panels). As under current operations, with facility improvements, the Imnaha Satellite Facility would be staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week during fish trapping. The trap would be checked for fish several times a day, including at first daylight (Grassel 2003). Bull trout would not be held in the trap for weighing nor would they be handled unnecessarily. The proposed trapping period (May – October 1) is not likely to result in increased trapping of bull trout, since adults move upstream past the facility in June through August (FishPro/HDR 2004a).

020-29

Section 3.3.3 of the Draft EIS states that no substantial changes to state or federally listed species, big game, or their habitats (including elimination, disturbance, or enhancement of designated critical habit or primary travel routes) would occur as a result of project implementation at the Imnaha Satellite Facility.

020-30

Comment acknowledged; effects to vegetation and botany are limited to sites of existing facilities.

020-31

Construction would be monitored, and the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest archaeologist, tribal archaeologist, and the State Historic Preservation Office consulted, as appropriate.

020-32

Comment acknowledged; the recommendations to protect scenic values have been incorporated into project design.

020-33

Comment acknowledged; Lostine facilities would not invade the Lostine Wild and Scenic River.

020-34

Comment acknowledged; Lostine facilities would not unreasonably diminish the scenery, recreation, or wildlife values of the Lostine Wild and Scenic River.

020-35

Comment acknowledged; this information appears to be consistent with that used in development of this EIS.

020-36

The Draft EIS (Section 3.6.3) states that construction of the Lostine River Hatchery could potentially result in temporary, above-baseline levels of sediments in the river, but that sediment levels would likely be controlled and maintained at below the level of significance (below the level of water quality violation and/or waste discharge violation) through the use of erosion control measures and other best management practices. Refer to response 020-18.

020-37

As stated in the Draft EIS (Section 3.2.3.1), instream construction would take place over two seasons and all instream work would be performed during work windows established by ODFW. Instream work periods were established to avoid vulnerable life stages of key species, including chinook and bull trout. Therefore, limiting project work to the instream work window would minimize potential impacts to fish. Project permit applications would also be reviewed by NOAA Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Oregon Department of State Lands, and ODFW to ensure compliance with federal and state guidelines for instream construction and fish passage during construction.

The project Biological Assessment (Sections 4.2.2 and 5) provides additional detail on maintaining and monitoring fish passage during construction and which life stages would be expected to occur in the area during construction. As discussed in the Biological Assessment, passage of migrating adult bull trout and chinook may be temporarily delayed during instream work and fish that inhabit the local area would be temporarily displaced. Juvenile bull trout, however, would most likely be further upstream during site construction (avoiding the relatively warm water temperatures in this stretch of the river).

020-38

Potential project impacts on rearing habitat in the river channel are summarized in the Draft EIS (Section 3.2.3.1) and discussed in detail in the project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2, Channel Alterations subsections) for all project facilities. About 310 linear feet of fill and riprap would be placed stream-side of existing vegetation within the side channel floodproofing location. Although some herbaceous plants may be lost, the amount of riprap to be placed is relatively small.

Alteration of river hydrology due to placement of instream structures may occur, but on a very localized scale, and overall, only small amounts of fish habitat would be affected and river temperature, flow, and geomorphology would not be affected. Any modified fish behavior or distribution would be on an individual level (i.e., affected fish would likely relocate to areas adjacent to the site).

020-39

Comment acknowledged; see response 020-38.

020-40

Surface water quality issues are summarized in the Draft EIS (Section 3.2.3.1) and discussed in detail in the project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2, Water Quality subsections) for all project facilities. No change in water quality, other than potential temporary, construction-related impacts, would be associated with the Lostine facilities. Through the Environmental Protection Agency's NPDES permit process, Oregon has set limits for hatchery discharge water quality to ensure that receiving waters are not overloaded with potentially detrimental amounts of substances that may adversely affect the environment, including plants, animals, and water quality. Estimates of the concentration of total suspended solids in hatchery effluent were made based on the hatchery's preliminary production plan and this value was within the limitations of the general NPDES permit for aquaculture operations of the size of the proposed Lostine River Hatchery (Biological Assessment, Section 4.2.2). Once operational, the hatchery would be subject to NPDES monitoring and reporting requirements. Hatchery design includes a cleaning waste basin to settle, collect, and store solid wastes for proper disposal as well as best management practices for hatchery operations and chemical handling (Draft EIS, Sections 2.1.1.3 and 3.2.3.1).

020-41

Surface water requirements are summarized in the Draft EIS (Section 3.2.3.1) and discussed in detail in the project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2, Water Gains and Losses subsections) for all project facilities. Diversion of surface water from the intake to the outfall structure at the proposed Lostine River Hatchery would take place over a linear distance of about 3,200 feet (see Final EIS, Chapter 2). For an average year, there appears to be adequate flow in the Lostine River to accommodate all hatchery demands. Strategies that would be taken during drier and/or colder years to reduce or accommodate project water demand are discussed in the project Biological Assessment Section 4.2.2). These strategies were incorporated into project design to ensure that a flow of 12 cfs or 50 percent of the total river flow, whichever is higher, would be maintained through the diversion reach to provide adequate fish habitat and passage.

020-42

Refer to responses 020-40 and -41. As discussed in the Draft EIS (Section 3.2.3.1) and the project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2, Channel Alterations subsection), the amount of vegetation to be removed at the intake, outfall, and side-channel sites would be limited to the least extent possible. Riparian vegetation at the side channel floodproofing location is limited to low-growing shrubs and herbaceous vegetation, which do not provide significant shading benefits. About 310 linear feet of fill and riprap would be placed stream-side of existing vegetation within this side channel. Although some herbaceous plants may be lost, the amount of riprap to be placed is relatively small. At the intake and outfall locations, a limited number of trees may be removed. Reduction in shading or overhanging vegetation is anticipated to be minimal and fish would likely relocate to areas adjacent to the project site that have suitable riparian vegetation cover.

Also as discussed in the Draft EIS (Section 3.2.3.1) and the project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2, Water Gains and Losses subsection), for an average year, there appears to be adequate flow in the Lostine River to accommodate hatchery demands, while leaving no less than 65 percent of the flow in the river. To provide adequate fish habitat and passage, a minimum river depth of 0.8 feet would be maintained. Approximately 10 cfs is required (R2 Resources 2002) to achieve this depth, but to ensure passage, a 20 percent buffer would be added and a minimum flow of 12 cfs would be maintained. Section 4.2.2 of the Biological Assessment also explains that the water withdrawal would not adversely affect species on a watershed scale because only 14 percent of a small reach of spawning habitat would be affected for only 2 weeks each year. When average stream flows are at their lowest, no chinook, steelhead, or bull trout spawning occurs and juveniles, if present, would have sufficient water for rearing and migration.

020-43

The Draft EIS (Section 3.6.3) states that project construction could potentially result in temporary, above-baseline levels of sediments in the river, but that levels would likely be controlled and maintained to below the level of significance (below the level of water quality violation and/or waste discharge violation) through the use of erosion control measures and best management practices. Refer to response 020-18.

020-44

As discussed in the Draft EIS (Section 3.2.3.1) and the project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2, Channel Alterations subsection), the Lostine Adult Collection Facility would be constructed to maintain both upstream and downstream fish passage during construction and to improve fish passage conditions over the long term (i.e. provide better passage than under current conditions). The Oregon Department of State Lands and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would permit instream construction activities and all project work would be performed during instream work windows established by ODFW to minimize potential impacts to important fish, wildlife, and habitat, with primary consideration to threatened, endangered, or sensitive species. These instream work periods were established to avoid the vulnerable life stages of key species. Therefore, limiting work to the instream work window would minimize potential instream work impacts to fish at the population level.

020-45

Comment acknowledged; any modified fish behavior or distribution would be on an individual level (i.e., affected fish would likely relocate to areas adjacent to the site).

020-46

The replacement ladder and proposed weir for the existing Lostine Adult Collection Facility were specifically designed to efficiently and safely accommodate migrating fish, including bull trout. As summarized in the Draft EIS (Sections 2.1 and 3.2.3.1) and discussed in the project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2, Operation of Fish Traps, Ladders and Weirs subsection), construction of the ladder is anticipated to improve fish passage as compared to existing conditions. The Lostine Adult Collection Facility structures were designed to allow trapping of adult spring chinook broodstock during higher spring runoff conditions. The Lostine weir was specifically designed to efficiently and safely accommodate migrating fish and meet NOAA Fisheries design standards. Weir angle and attraction flow were designed to lead migrating fish into the trap with minimal delay. The fish ladder would be fitted with a removable trapping structure that would trap spring chinook salmon, steelhead, and larger trout; small fish (less than about 1-inch wide) would be able to swim volitionally through the ladder and move upstream from the weir. The spring chinook not selected for broodstock, and all non-target species, would be released from the trap and allowed to continue upstream within 24 hours of trapping. As under current operations, no non-target fish (including bull trout) would be held for more than 24 hours. Typically during fish trapping, monitoring would occur much more frequently than once per 24-hour period. All non-target fish would be allowed to pass above the weir. During non-trapping periods, the trapping structure would be removed from the fish ladder and the ladder would provide unrestricted fish passage.

020-47

Project performance standards were developed and reviewed by the Independent Scientific Review Panel and finalized as the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for Northeast Oregon Hatchery Imnaha and Grande Ronde Subbasin Spring Chinook Salmon (Hesse and Harbeck 2004). The ISRP completed its review of this plan on May 18, 2004 and responded "...that this document is an excellent working draft of a stand-alone M&E Plan for the NEOH hatchery Imnaha and Grande Ronde subbasin spring chinook salmon program." The ISRP also further complimented the authors "...for being among the first to bring the modern EMAP [Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program] probabilistic sampling procedures into the Columbia Basin." Monitoring and

evaluation elements of this plan would be applied to the currently permitted program and are incorporated into the Final EIS and Biological Assessment by reference as supporting documentation.

020-48

Comment acknowledged; refer to responses 020-40, -42, -44, and -46. As stated in the Draft EIS (Section 3.2.3.1) and project Biological Assessment (Section 4.2.2), reasonable and prudent measures to minimize harassment to species, and bull trout in particular, are taken (and would continue to be taken) at all existing and proposed NEOH facilities. These measures include minimal handling of bull trout, monitoring the trap, and observation of fish condition, particularly during trapping periods. As under current operations, if any bull trout appear to be injured or stressed, hatchery operators would continue to notify the Snake River Basin Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. It is agreed that the overall affect on the Lostine River steelhead population is not expected to be substantial, but may be somewhat beneficial given proposed project improvements to fish passage. As documented in the project Biological Assessment, the minor amount of habitat lost is not anticipated to impact the populations of listed species, including spring/summer chinook, in the watershed.

020-49

Comment acknowledged; proposed work at the Lookingglass Hatchery would not invade the portion of the Grande Ronde River designated as Wild and Scenic. Also, the Bureau of Land Management was contacted (Kuck 2003, personnel communication) and concluded that they had no concerns related to this project and Wild and Scenic River status. The State of Oregon (Vergari 2004, personal communication) was also contacted and affirmed that Grande Ronde state-designated scenic waterway begins at the confluence with the Wallowa River and would not be affected by the proposed project.

020-50

Comment acknowledged; the proposed Lookingglass Hatchery improvements would not affect the scenery, recreation, fish, or wildlife values of the Grande Ronde Wild and Scenic River.